

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

SCOT PERKET,

Plaintiff,

v.

LA CROSSE COUNTY POLICE
DEPARTMENT,

Defendants.

ORDER

Case No. 16-cv-362-wmc

SCOT PERKET,

Plaintiff,

v.

ST. FRANCIS OF MAYO HEALTH CARE
LA CROSSE (COUNTY), et al.

Defendants.

ORDER

Case No. 16-cv-507-wmc

SCOT PERKET,

Plaintiff,

v.

LA CROSSE COUNTY JAIL DEPUTIES, et al.

Defendants.

ORDER

Case No. 16-cv-525-wmc

Pro se plaintiff Scot Alan Perket has filed 13 lawsuits since May 2016, alleging a variety of wrongs against numerous, varied defendants. In each of the cases captioned above, most or all of the defendants have filed motions to dismiss on various grounds. (Case No. 16-cv-362-wmc, dkt. # 8; Case No. 16-cv-507-wmc, dkts. #8, #13, #20; Case No. 16-cv-525, dkts. #9, #16.)

On March 21, 2017, in light of Perket's failure to submit *anything* in these three cases beyond his complaint and filing fee, the court entered an order to show cause in each, directing Perket to explain whether his complete failure to respond to these motions occurred for good reason, as well as requiring his prompt filing of oppositions to defendants' many pending motions to dismiss. The court further warned Perket that failure to respond would likely result in the court granting defendants' pending motions and dismissal of these actions due to Perket's failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

When the court's March 21 order was returned as undeliverable, the clerk of court called him on three different occasions to update his address and inform him about the court's order. (*See* dkt. #19.) However, each attempt was unsuccessful because Perket did not answer his phone and his voicemail was full. While the court surmises that Perket may be facing personal and financial difficulties, these lawsuits were his responsibility to prosecute, and his continued inaction confirms the court's impression that he has abandoned them.

Since his deadline to show cause of April 3, 2017, is long since passed, and Perket has filed nothing (nor made any other discernable effort to contact the court) despite the clerk of court's notable efforts to help and reach out to him, dismissal is now unavoidable. As such, the court will grant all pending motions to dismiss, entering judgment in defendants' favor and closing these matters.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that defendants' motions to dismiss in Case No. 16-cv-362-wmc (dkt. #8), Case No. 16-cv-507-wmc, (dkt. #8, #13, #20) and Case No. 16-cv-525-wmc (dkt. #9, #16) are GRANTED. In light of plaintiff's failure to prosecute, the clerk of court is directed to enter judgment in defendants' favor and close these matters.

Entered this 21st day of August , 2017.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

WILLIAM M. CONLEY
District Judge